



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/664,294	09/18/2000	Nathan F. Raciborski	19396-001300US 3787		
7590 04/15/2005			EXAMINER		
Thomas D Franklin			BATES, KEVIN T		
. Townsend and	Townsend and Crew LLP				
8th Floor			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Two Embarcadero Center			2155		
San Francisco, CA 94111-3834			DATE MAILED: 04/15/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s)		
09/664,294	RACIBORSKI ET AL.	RACIBORSKI ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit			
Kevin Bates	2155			

	Kevin Bates	2155	0			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED <u>28 March 2005</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AI	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.				
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or o this application, applicant must timely file one of the folloplaces the application in condition for allowance; (2) a N (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in comp following time periods: 	owing replies: (1) an amendment, a otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in liance with 37 CFR 1.114. The repl	ffidavit, or other evide compliance with 37 (ence, which CFR 41.31; or			
The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened strabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2)	n fee under 37 as set forth in (b)			
NOTICE OF APPEAL	ntianas with 27 OFD 44 27 must be	a filad within two man	the of the data			
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must 	extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal (of the appeal.			
AMENDMENTS	Lukuda ka ka daka affilian a bula	f will not be outland	hasausa			
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further contains. 	· -		because			
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	The state of the s	TE below,				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or		educing or simplifying	the issues for			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a))		ejected claims.				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.		ompliant Amendmen	t (PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s). 	allowable if submitted in a separate	, timely filed amendn	nent canceling			
7. Solution For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proposed. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		vill be entered and an	explanation of			
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-21</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessa	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	eal and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	-					
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by	ut does NOT place the application	in condition for allowa	ance because:			
See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).						
12. Note the attached information Disclosure Statement(s) 13. Other:	. (F10/36/06 01 P10-1449) Paper	140(5).				

Continuation of 11 does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because. Regarding claim 1, the applicant argues that the reference Tripp, does not disclose a first timer and that a brochure file is not directory information. The examiner disagrees, regarding the existence of a first timer, as mentioned by the applicant, Tripp discloses having a number of check cycles to check a webpage for a brochure file, if no brochure file is found after the number of cycles then it removes that web page from the system, a check cycle is a set period of time, and the number of cycles is a multiple of that period of time, thus there is a period of time that is set by the system to find the file on the web page, thus a timer giving the web page a time period to have the brochure file or else it gets removed. As for the idea that a brochure file is not directory information, a brochure file identifies and helps classify a website, and enables that website to be cataloged on the brochure database, thus giving it a directory in the database, so it can be considered directory information.

Regarding claim 7, the applicant argues that Tripp and Kraft does not disclose a directory web page that organizes at least a plurality of content objects included in the global catalog by categories. The examiner disagrees, as seen in the rejection, Tripp discloses a web page, search engine that can find the brochure files according to their data fields, which is their categories.

HOSAIN ALAM